

PA  
6276  
E47c

ELLIS

CATULLUS IN THE  
XIVth CENTURY

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY

A  
A  
0  
0  
0  
4  
3  
8  
0  
8  
3  
8



THE LIBRARY  
OF  
THE UNIVERSITY  
OF CALIFORNIA  
LOS ANGELES

# CATULLUS IN THE XIV<sup>TH</sup> CENTURY

BY

ROBINSON ELLIS, M.A., HON. LL.D.

CORPUS PROFESSOR OF LATIN

LONDON

HENRY FROWDE

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS WAREHOUSE, AMEN CORNER, E.C.

OXFORD: 116 HIGH STREET

1905

*Price One Shilling net*



Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2008 with funding from  
Microsoft Corporation

# CATULLUS IN THE XIV<sup>TH</sup> CENTURY

BY

ROBINSON ELLIS, M.A., HON. LL.D.

CORPUS PROFESSOR OF LATIN

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA  
AT LOS ANGELES  
LIBRARY

LONDON

HENRY FROWDE

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS WAREHOUSE, AMEN CORNER, E.C.

OXFORD: 116 HIGH STREET

1905



## CATULLUS IN THE FOURTEENTH CENTURY

FEW things are more remarkable in the history of the tradition of Latin texts than the obscurity which still attaches to the discovery of Catullus' poems in the fourteenth century. Lachmann in his edition of 1829 gave prominence to this point by prefixing to the poems an epigram, which in the earliest MS. where it is found (dated 1375) is inscribed *Versus Domini Beneueneruti<sup>1</sup> de Campezanis de Vicencia de resurrectione Catulli poetæ Veronensis*.

Ad patriam uenio longis a finibus exul,  
Causa mei reditus compatriota<sup>2</sup> fuit,  
Scilicet a calamis tribuit cui Francia nomen,  
Quique notat turbæ prætereuntis iter,  
Quo licet ingenio uestrum celebrate Catullum,  
Cuius sub modio clausa papyrus erat.

The controversies which have been raised over these six lines are well known. What were the far-off confines where Catullus had been hidden in a prolonged exile? Who was the compatriot that brought him back? What name is concealed in the description *a calamis tribuit cui Francia nomen*? Are we to understand the words *Cuius sub modio clausa papyrus erat* as only meaning that the MS. in which the poems were discovered had been 'a light hidden under a bushel,' or may we believe that it was a real *papyrus*, perhaps found in some oriental clime?

<sup>1</sup> Thus anagrammatized by Ferreto of Vicenza in some verses addressed to Mussato: Cui cognomen anis CAMPVS dedit et BENE nomen Cum Vestro, patriæque fuit sat magnus in illa Qua retro pæne fluens Patano delabitur annis (Zardo, *Albertino Mussato*, p. 292). Similarly in the twelfth of the series of poems by the three friends Mussato, Lovati, and Bonetini, published by Padrin in 1887, Campesano tui fecit reuerentia Camer Quam tibi cognatae Musae coluere Latinae Perpetuos fructus omni sub sole ferentem.

<sup>2</sup> Probably a Veronese, just as Coluccio Salutati writing to the Paduan Francesco Zabarella calls him *Compatriota Mussati* (Zardo, p. 283).

As nothing connected with the history of so great a poet as Catullus can ever be thought superfluous, I may be allowed to mention here the chief *new* theories as to the name of his discoverer. The earlier views I have mentioned in the Prolegomena to my large edition. Pignorius (cent. xvii) seems rightly to have detected in *Francia* the name *Francesco*; whether a *calamis* represents a surname (as Scaliger, Lessing, and our own scholar, the late Benjamin Jowett, thought), or an official title, perhaps that of a *notary*, as the fourth verse seems to intimate, *Quique notat turbæ prætereuntis iter*, is quite uncertain. It can hardly have been Bernardino Plumati as Lessing thought, nor Francesco Notapassanti, as Lachmann (perhaps only half-seriously) suggested in a letter to Moriz Haupt (p. 27 of *Karl Lachmann's Briefe an Moriz Haupt*). More recently Costantino Nigra in his excellent work *La Chioma di Berenice* (Milan, 1891) has suggested that the name was Frassapaya da Ponti. This seems to occur in the *Chronicle* of Parisio of Cereta, a small town not far from Verona, as the name of a podestà of Cereta in 1256. Frassapaya might represent *Francus calumus*; da Ponti would explain *Quique notat turbæ prætereuntis iter*, the *bridge* taking note of the passengers who crossed by a toll-gate at one or both ends.

Mr. Falconer Madan thought the name might be Francesco Accorsi; for, as Näke long ago suggested, the occurrence of *cursum* for *turbæ* in some MSS., notably in Scaliger's, the *Cuiacianus* (now identified with a MS. in possession of Mr. Samuel Allen of Dublin) is perhaps significant. Näke indeed elicited from the words of the Epigram nothing more recondite than 'Francesco the scribe at the corner of the Corso,' remarking that most Italian towns of any importance have such a Corso, and that it is just in such a locality that an official employed to take note of the passers-by would naturally be stationed<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> Näke takes no small credit to himself for his explanation, which he confesses did not obtain the assent of Niebuhr, but which he boldly predicts will stand for ever (*stare in æternum poterit*), when Lessing's more elaborate theory will be forgotten.



Francesco Accorsi, son of the great jurist and *glossator* of the same name, was a man of mark in the thirteenth century, as the fact of King Edward I taking him to England and his appointment to a law-lecturership in Oxford later prove: he had also seen France and for that time was a well-travelled man. Dante combines him with Brunetto Latini and the grammarian Priscian in the fifteenth Canto of the *Inferno*. He is said to have died in the last decade of the thirteenth century, and Mazzuchelli records an inscription from the tomb of Francesco and his more celebrated father in the cemetery of St. Francesco at Bologna. But I do not see how he could be called a *compatriot* of the Veronese poet Catullus as a citizen of Bologna, nor how the words *a calamis* and *Quique notat turbæ prætereuntis iter* of the Epigram could in any true sense be applied to him. Sir E. M. Thompson has suggested to me that some such name as *Strada* might be intended. There was a Luca *della Penna* whom Pope Gregory XI (1370-1378) employed as his intermediary with Petrarch to borrow copies of some of the works of Cicero which Petrarch was credited with discovering. But this must have been considerably later in the fourteenth century than the time when Catullus re-emerged (De Nolhae, pp. 180, 181). The *names*, however, would suit the Epigram very well. Or are we to trace in *a calamis* an occult allusion to Avignon (*avena*)? Francis of Avignon could of course be none but Petrarch himself; the other verse would designate him as a *notaio*.

It will be clear from these widely different guesses that the riddle of Campesani's Epigram is still unexplained; all that seems fairly made out is that the poems were rediscovered in some region far removed from the immediate neighbourhood of Verona, probably indeed not in Italy. We should not forget that this was the time when the Papacy was no longer in Rome, but at Avignon, a circumstance which M. de Nolhae shows in his admirable *Pétrarque et l'humanisme* to have had a potent influence on the history of classical learning.

It is only in these days of palaeographical research that the question as to the meaning of *papyrus* in the Epigram could occur. In a paper read to the Oxford Philological Society in 1903, I suggested that the figure of a long-legged bird which recurs so often in the Canonici MS. of Catullus may date from a *papyrus* archetype. At least there is a close agreement between this figure and that of a long-legged bird found in column V of the recently discovered papyrus of Timotheos the Milesian, edited by Wilamowitz. This bird-figure he suggests may have served the purpose of a *coronis*, and some such use it may have had in the lost archetype of the MSS. of Catullus, surviving in Canon. Lat. 30, and in this, it would appear, alone. This is of course a pure conjecture, and must wait for confirmation from similar instances not yet known or recorded.

I shall now proceed to inquire what are the earliest traces of the poems of Catullus, after their rediscovery by a compatriot, as recorded in the Epigram, either in actual quotations containing the poet's name, or in citations obviously drawn from his works.

1. There are two collections of *flores scriptorum* belonging to the early fourteenth century, both of which contain quotations from Catullus.

The smaller of these two MSS. is here mentioned first because it is dated, 1329. It was written at Verona, and contains this excerpt (lib. II. 3)—*de errore. Catullus ad Varum. Quem non in aliqua re (uidere om.) Suffenum Possis, suus cuique attributus est error. Sed non uidemus mantice quod in tergo est* (xxii. 18-20). This points to a complete copy of the poems; for only such a copy would be likely to contain *ad Varum*. The MS. of the rediscovered poems had been brought back to Verona before Campesani's death in 1323; a Veronese scribe in the interval between its discovery (perhaps as early as 1314 or 1315) and 1329 (when the collection of excerpts was made) had seen in the MS., or drawn from some one who had seen it, the above extract.

A much larger collection of *Flores*, purporting to belong

to nearly the same period, is known as the *Compendium morulium notabilium per Hierimiam iudicem de Montagnone ciuem Paduanum*. This work exists in a printed form, Ven. 1505, a copy of which is in the possession of Professor Bywater, another in the Bodleian. I have seen four MSS. of it, all, I should suppose, of the fifteenth century. One of these is in the British Museum, Add. 22,801; of the other three two are in the Bodleian, one at New College (100). The extracts, which are mainly of an ethical character, or at least bearing on the conduct of life, are taken from a very wide range of authors, including, besides those easily forthcoming, such as Horace, Juvenal, Vergil, Terence, Statius, Lucan, Martial, Persius, Ovid, Avianus' Fables, Boetius, others less widely read, such as Sallust, Frontinus, Vegetius, Cassiodorus, and the curious *Cronica de nugis philosophorum*.

The *Compendium* contains seven citations from Catullus, quoted not by the *order* of the poems as they follow each other in our MSS. of Catullus, but by sections, or as they are sometimes called books (*libri*). As the 76th poem is cited from the xith or xiith section, the total number was perhaps not over thirteen or fourteen. I will mention them in order.

xxii. 18 omnes fallimur—attributus est error: in sect. v.

xxxix. 16 risu inepto res ineptior nulla est: in sect. v.

li. 15 otium et reges prius et beatas Perdidit urbes: in sect. v.

lxiv. 143-148 Nulla uiro iuranti femina credat—periuria curant: in sect. viii.

lxvi. 15, 16 Estne nouis nuptis—lacrimulis: in sect. ix.

lxviii. 137 Ne nimium simus stultorum more molesti: in sect. ix.

lxxvi. 13 Difficile est longum subito deponere amorem: in sect. xi (one MS. xii).

These sections seem to be rightly preserved in the last four extracts, but the 5th section containing xxii. 18, xxxix. 16, li. 15 is too comprehensive, containing as it does a total of 428 verses. Probably the first of these passages may

have belonged to sect. iv, and only the other two to sect. v, if indeed, which is not certain, these sections were all of equal length. The Preface to Cornelius Nepos, and the two poems on Lesbia's sparrow, *may* have constituted sect. i. for there is reason to believe that the sparrow-poems were sometimes a *libellus* by themselves. This is of course a matter of uncertainty. For us the important point to be noticed is the agreement in the order of the sections with the order of the poems of Catullus as they occur in our MSS., the early poems being quoted from the earlier sections, the later from the later. Bearing this in mind, we shall not be too hasty in accepting the wholly unproven hypothesis that these extracts in Montagnone's *Compendium* were drawn, not from the rediscovered codex of Catullus but from some Anthologia in which excerpts from Catullus were included. Such a theory is at once gratuitous and at variance with fact. No anthology of the middle age prior to 1300 has yet been found containing complete lines from Catullus, still less with the addition of his name.

If then Montagnone drew his excerpts from Catullus direct, we may perhaps infer that the archetypal codex rediscovered by the poet's compatriot was divided into short books or sections, which fell out from the later transcripts, giving way to the division into separate poems, with their titles, which also formed part of the same codex. This might naturally happen, as the reference by books or chapters was comparatively vague, and the other division would be for practical purposes more available.

The precise date at which the *Compendium* was written is unknown. Scardeone (1478-1564) in his work *De Antiquitate Urbis Patavii*, p. 235, ed. Basil, 1560, says he died about 1300. But the last mention of his name in the *Matricula Collegii Iudicum civitatis Paduæ*, preserved in the Archives of the University of Padua, belongs to the year 1321. Accordingly the date assigned by Rajna to the compilation of the *Compendium*, the last decade of the

thirteenth century, must be considered precarious. It would much assist our inquiry if any MS. of the work were forthcoming which belonged to the early fourteenth century. All those hitherto examined, I believe, date from the fifteenth, except the MS. in St. Mark's, Venice, 295 in Valentinelli's Catalogue (iv. p. 186), which he assigns to the fourteenth century, and which he considers to have been used by the Venetian editor from its general agreement. The New College MS. is dated at the end of the second treatise (fol. 130-158) consisting of Homilies, Sept. 17, 1400. But it is more than possible that MSS. of an earlier date still await examination. Meanwhile, as I have stated in my large Catullus, there are very clear indications of the source whence Montagnone drew being identical with the *fontes* of our existing MSS. of Catullus. Thus in lxiv. 145 the archetype seems to have had not *apisci* but *adipisci*, which appears in the printed edition of Montagnone, and is found or traceable in each of the two earliest of our MSS. of Catullus: again the corrupt *atque parentum* of lxvi. 16 was also in the codex whence Montagnone drew the passage as quoted in his *Compendium*.

I proceed to the second part of my inquiry. What traces of acquaintance with Catullus' poems can be found in the writers of the earlier part of the fourteenth century?

This inquiry seems to centre chiefly in Padua and its neighbour Venice. Three names emerge as interesting: they are the poet and historiographer, Albertino Mussato, born in 1261, died in 1329; Lovato di Lovati, born about 1240, died in 1309; Bovatino di Bovatini, died in 1301. They were close friends, and a collection of Latin poems which they exchanged with each other has been preserved in a MS. of St. Mark's at Venice (class. xiv. no. 223) and published at Padua by Luigi Padrin in 1887<sup>1</sup>. All three were men of mark among their con-

<sup>1</sup> This volume, of which only 40 copies were printed, is rare and almost inaccessible. I have been able, however, to examine it in the British Museum. Padrin's elaborate edition of Mussato's tragedy *Ecerinis*, with Carducci's valuable estimate of it as a poem, was published at

temporaries. Bovatini was for forty years the chief authority on ecclesiastical law at Padua. Lovati knew Petrarch, who eulogizes his poems and declares he would have been the first poet of his time, if he had not taken up law as a profession and combined the Twelve Tables with the nine Muses. We must regret that so little of Lovati's poetical workmanship has survived (Wicksteed, *Dante and Giovanni del Virgilio*, Append. II). But by far the most distinguished member of the triad was Albertino Mussato, a man memorable as patriot, poet, historian. In his famous tragedy *Ecerinis*, 629 verses describing the cruelties and disastrous end of Ezzelino III, tyrant of Padua, beyond Nero in cruelty<sup>1</sup>, as he is described by the Latin commentator on *Ecerinis*, Guizzardo of Bologna (Padrin, p. 83), Mussato imitated, as well as the learning of that time allowed, the iambics and lyrical metres of Seneca. In his study of this model Mussato had a compeer in his friend Lovati, who has left notes on the metres of Seneca's tragedies in a MS. preserved in the Vatican Library<sup>2</sup> (1796). Mussato's mastery of the iambic in the *Ecerinis* is very imperfect; impossible caesuras, such as *Saeuae tyrannidis ita ut ancipites uices*, *Nam quisque liber arbiter in actus suos*, are very frequent and greatly impair the poetical effect. In the *Achilles*, a later tragedy which must also belong to the fourteenth century<sup>3</sup> and which till 1832 was generally, if not universally, believed to be by Mussato, the imitation of Seneca is equally palpable, especially of his diction and love of affected conceits; but the management of the iambic

Bologna in 1900. Not the least part of the importance of this work is the publicity given by Padrin to the Holkham MS. of Mussato's Latin poems.

<sup>1</sup> Dante includes him among other monsters of cruelty in Canto XII of the *Inferno*.

<sup>2</sup> Carducci ap. Padrin, p. 272.

<sup>3</sup> In the Holkham MS., which contains both *Ecerinis* and *Achilles*, the colophon at the end of the former is *Albertini Muxati Paduani Eccerini Tragedia Explicit* 1390. This is immediately followed by *Tragedia Achillis*, but without mention of the author's name. As Mr. Alexander Napier, librarian of Holkham, suggests, it would be a natural inference that *Achilles* was also by Mussato.



is considerably improved, though sometimes, especially in the beginning, the same faults are traceable as in the *Ecerinis*. Mussato, who from the age of thirty had been the representative man of Padua, whose counsels were indispensable in every undertaking of the republic, then at the height of its prosperity (A. Gloria, *Documenti inediti intorno a Francesco Petrarca e Albertino Mussato*, p. 10), was thought to have achieved a high success by his *Ecerinis*, and, after a recitation of it in presence of the assembled Paduans was crowned in the palazzo del Commune with a wreath of myrtle and ivy and conducted home in triumph. The date of this, according to Carducci (Padrin, *Ecerinide*, p. 254) was Dec. 2, 1315; others assign it to 1314. A Latin Commentary<sup>1</sup> on the poem was shortly afterwards drawn up by Guizzardo of Bologna and Castellani of Bassano which is still extant, dated Dec. 21, 1317.

I have not detected either in the *Ecerinis* or this Latin commentary upon it, anything which even remotely points to a knowledge of Catullus. Of Seneca's tragedies both show considerable knowledge, and any *étude* on these would be imperfect which did not take Mussato's poem into account.

In the other tragedy, *Achilles*, closely resembling Mussato's *Ecerinis* in form and long ascribed to him, certainly too written not after the fourteenth century, though perhaps belonging to a later part of it, I seem to discern at least some recognizable traces of a knowledge of Catullus. One of these I noticed in my first edition of Catullus (1867). Some sapphies in a chorus of this play contain the words *Nemo tam fortis ualeat esse quo non Fortior assit* (p. 30, ed. Ven. 1635). This looks like an imitation of Cat. lxvi. 27, 8 *Anne bonum oblita es facinus, quo regium adepta es Coniugium, quod non fortior ausit alis?* Here MSS. give *aut sit*, and *assit* appears to be a conjectural emendation of this. The same tragedy *Achilles* contains the rare combination *celebrare tardus* (p. 28) to which it would be difficult to find any parallel except Cat. lxiv. 302 *Nec*

<sup>1</sup> Printed entire by Padrin, *Ecerinide*, pp. 69-247.

*Thetidis tædas uoluit celebrare iugalis: iuxta* like Cat. lxvi. 66 *Callisto iuxta Lycaonia(m)*: and Catullus' (lxiv. 181) *Respersum iuuenem fraterna cuede secuta* perhaps finds an echo in *uirgo pollutus manus Fratrum cruore sordido tactu feret* (Achilles, p. 21), though the source may possibly be Seneca.

It is, however, in the other, preeminently the elegiac, poems of Mussato, not in the *Eccerinis* nor the debatable *Achilles*, that we find more tangible indications of the rediscovered Roman lyrist. In one of these, the *Epistola ad Collegium Artistarum* (p. 39, ed. Ven.), Mussato mentions Catullus in a way which, though not proving that he had read the two poems on Lesbia's sparrow, is most naturally explained on that hypothesis.

Non ego fagineis cecini te Tityre siluis  
Scripta Dionaei nec mihi gesta ducis.  
Carmine sub nostro cupidi lasciuia Catulli  
Lesbia, dulce tibi nulla susurrat ausis.

In particular the verb *susurrat*, not in itself a very happy word for a sparrow's chirp, looks like a reference to *pipilabat* (iii. 10). Similarly in Epist. xviii the lines *Quod pater Oceanus fuerit, quod mater aquarum Thetis* (sic) *et in liquidis exertas Naiadas undis*, are not obscurely modelled partly on Catull. lxxxviii. 5, 6 *Suscipit, o Gelli, quantum non ultima thetis* (sic) *Nec genitor nympharum abluuit Oceanus*, partly on lxiv. 13, 14, where the Nereids are described rising breast-high from the sea to gaze on the Argo. In another poem of Mussato's (Ep. 3), headed *Eiusdem ad Rolandum iudicem de pluciola*<sup>1</sup>, I trace a knowledge of Catullus' Elegy to Hortalus (lxv) in three consecutive verses:

Tota superciliis nigrescent tempora toruis  
Inuidaque<sup>2</sup> infundens obruet ora rubor  
Deffer (?) enim tectam ueluti sub ueste salutem.  
Catull. lxv. 21-24:

Quod miserae oblitae molli sub ueste locatum,  
Dum aduentu matris prosilit, excutitur,

<sup>1</sup> Holkham MS. 425, fol. 34.

<sup>2</sup> *Liuidaque*, Holkham MS.



Atque illud prono praeceps agitur decursu,  
Huic *manat* tristi conscius ore *rubor*.

These resemblances, it may be said, are fugitive and not wholly convincing. I allow that there is nothing like the transference by Orientius of one whole verse of the Ovidian Ibis<sup>1</sup>, nothing as directly taken from Catullus, as many of Mussato's own Ovidian imitations are taken from Ovid. Possibly the poet had only succeeded in obtaining an imperfect copy of Catullus' poems; or as his confession seems to imply, he may have made a merit of abstaining from indecencies<sup>2</sup> such as abound in Catullus, turning by preference to the stately Muse of Tragedy and finding in his denunciations of tyranny a more assured solace as well as a more enviable crown. Or again, he may have had only an imperfect acquaintance with Catullus' principal metre, the phalaecean hendecasyllable; certainly it is nowhere found in the *Ecerinis*. Still, slight as they are, the resemblances which I have above cited are sufficient in my judgement to make it more than probable that Mussato had read at least some of the lyrics, perhaps only the two on the sparrow in the first or lyrical portion of the poems, probably all the elegiacs (lxv-cxvi) as well as the hexameter epyllion (lxiv).

The volume of Latin poems interchanged between the three friends Mussato, Lovati, and Bovatini, contains little which can be certainly traced to Catullus; there is, however, an exception, c. xvi, in which, besides combinations like *Tu bene quod novi—bene uelle potest* (Cat. xci. 3, lxxii. 8), the peculiar and rather rare<sup>3</sup> diction *tacita mente* is introduced into a hexameter in the very place of the verse in which it occurs in Catullus: *tacita quem mente gerebam* as compared with *tacita quem mente requirunt*, Cat. lxii. 37. This seems to occur in a poem of Mussato's.

Next to Mussato in order of time as vouchers for the

<sup>1</sup> Orient. Comm. ii. 315 'Ille miser uero nec erit miserabilis ulli'; Ov. Ib. 117 'Sisque miser semper nec sis miserabilis ulli.' See Bellanger's new *Étude sur le Commonitorium d'Orientius*, Paris, 1903.

<sup>2</sup> The only indecent poems are the *Priapus* and *Uxor Priapi*, both in the Holkham MS., but neither containing anything taken from Catullus.

<sup>3</sup> It is found, however, in Manil. ii. 60.

early rediscovery of Catullus are two friends, both among the earliest of the fourteenth century humanists, Guglielmo di Pastrengo and Francesco Petrarca.

Pastrengo is a township near Verona, whence Guglielmo is sometimes styled *orator Veronensis* (Tirab. v, p. 409). His life covers nearly the same ground as Petrarch's (1304-1374), though it is probable that Petrarch outlived him. Pastrengo was certainly alive in 1361, in which year he addressed a letter to Petrarch on the death by plague of his natural son Giovanni at the age of twenty-five<sup>1</sup>.

Tiraboschi (v. 294) quotes from Pastrengo's now almost inaccessible work *de originibus rerum*, a statement that he had attended the law lectures of Oldrado da Ponte, and supposes this to have been at Padua where Oldrado held a school in 1310. Supposing him to have been sixteen or seventeen at that time he would probably have been somewhat older than Petrarch. It was perhaps at Avignon that he made the acquaintance of the poet. To Avignon, as the truer representative of Rome, most of the aspiring young men of that age naturally turned. Oldrado is himself said to have held the post of consistorial advocate in the court of Pope John XXII; but whether this was or was not so, there seems to be reason for supposing that it was there that Pastrengo made the acquaintance of Petrarch, long before his public mission thither during the pontificate of Innocent VI (1352-1362). To Pastrengo Petrarch has addressed six Latin poems and five prose epistles; three letters of Pastrengo's to Petrarch survive according to Tiraboschi (v. 409). It is clear from the second of the poems that the two friends had toiled together to make the ground near the spring of the Sorgue habitable. They had torn away rocks and opened out the soil, not in vain, for when this letter was written 'nature had yielded to their toil, and a garden had sprung into view verdant with many-hued flowers'<sup>2</sup>; though in the end the

<sup>1</sup> De Nolhae, pp. 405, 406.

<sup>2</sup> 'Hic ubi te mecum convulsa revoluere saxa Non potuit campumque satis laxare malignum, Vernantem uariis uideas nunc floribus hortum' (tom. III. p. 104, ed. Basil. 1581).

river was too strong to be resisted, and the nymphs triumphed. Again, 'As I gaze on the waters, the meadows, the arbutes, the bays brought from another clime, the face of my Guglielmo meets me everywhere; on this mound we have sat, on this grass we have lain together, here we delighted to recall the Muses dispersed by a long exile, to compare together the poets of Greece and Latium<sup>1</sup>.' Another letter Petrarch begins with the words *Nomen tuum quo nihil dulcius audio* (Var. 37, p. 1023); in another he says he is waiting for the Eclogues of Calpurnius and Pastrengo's own MS. of Varro *de R. R.* as impatiently as is usual when anything has been promised him; elsewhere he begs from him a loan of books from his private library (De Nolhac, p. 54), or leaves his own books in his friend's charge (De Nolhac, p. 47). It is not surprising therefore to find that Pastrengo was himself an author. Sarti (*de claris Archigymn. Bonon. Professoribus*, i. p. 331, ed. 1896), says he wrote his *de originibus rerum*, an encyclopaedic work printed by Blondus, Ven. 1547, and now extremely rare, about the middle of the fourteenth century<sup>2</sup>. In this work there are two quotations which imply a knowledge of the poems of Catullus; p. 16<sup>a</sup>, Pastrengo describing a voluminous historiography by the Lombard Bencius, chancellor to Can Grande I, writes, *ut de eo dici possit quod scribit Veronensis poeta. dicens Ausus quidem unus Italarum omne aevum tribus explicare chartis .i. uoluminibus Iupiter doctis et laboriosis*. This is from the first poem of Catullus, and must have been drawn from the MS. brought to light early in the fourteenth century by the poet's compatriot, since the three verses are not extant in any ancient writer, and the description of Catullus as *Veronensis poeta* points to the *titulus* of the poems given by the MSS. as *Catullus Veronensis* or *Catulli Veronensis liber*. In the second passage, p. 18<sup>b</sup>, Pastrengo writes

<sup>1</sup> 'Hic longo exilio sparsas reuocare Camoenas, Hic Graios Latiosque simul conferre poetas Dulce fuit.' I understand *exilio* in the same sense as *exul* in the Epigram of Benvenuto de Camposanis, of writings, mainly of course poems, which had been long lost.

<sup>2</sup> Haupt (*Quaest. Catull.*, p. 5) says not before 1350.

*Catullus Veronensis poeta Ciceronis coetaneus librum uario metrorum genere exaratum, multa iocosa et placita continentem, scolasticis legendum tradidit Protholomaei Alexandri (? Ptolomaei et Alexandri) temporibus.* Here again we have an indubitable witness to the poems having been read by Pastrengo; they were, he says, in various metres, and contained much that was jocose and amusing; words which describe the amatory or light tone of the greater part of the *liber Catulli*.

There are two other passages where Pastrengo refers to Catullus, p. 85<sup>a</sup> and p. 88<sup>b</sup>, but the former, on Mamurra, is taken from Pliny's *Natural History*, xxxvi. 48, the second comes so directly from Isidorus' *Origines*, as to make it doubtful whether Pastrengo collated the two verses of Catullus (i. 1, 2) there cited with any actual MS. of Catullus, as Haupt believed.

In passing from Pastrengo to his friend Petrarch, the question meets us more palpably, Did the great humanist possess a MS. of Catullus? To this question we are now able to make a definitive answer, since the publication of M. de Nolhac's admirable work *Pétrarque et l'humanisme*. The quotations in Petrarch's Latin writings, no less than the actual imitations of lines or passages of Catullus in the *Sonetti* and *Canzoni*, would indeed be sufficient alone to prove the point; but the researches of M. de Nolhac have added another source of evidence little suspected before, a manuscript Vergil in which he entered illustrations or explanations of Vergil's text taken from a large list of Roman writers, including Catullus. The following details I take from M. de Nolhac.

There is in the Ambrosian Library of Milan a MS. containing the *Bucolies*, *Georgics*, *Aeneid* with Servius' Commentary, scholia on the *Achilleis* of Statius, then the *Achilleis* itself, followed by some *Odes* of Horace. This MS. was Petrarch's and one of the earliest he possessed; it was stolen from him in 1326 and restored in 1338 when he was at Avignon, for so a note informs us in his own handwriting. The MS. shared his travels, spite of its size and heaviness,

and bears the traces of his prolonged and continuous study in a thick mass of notes with which he has filled its text and margins. It exhibits the ingenuity and elaborate learning of the humanist from many different sides, not only such as directly touch the Vergilian poems, e.g. history, geography, or metre, but less directly, as in moral or religious reflexions bearing on his own time, and occasionally as suggesting a symbolic or allegorical meaning which must have been quite alien from Vergil's thoughts. Of the extent of Petrarch's reading we can have no ampler voucher; a list of the authors quoted is given by De Nolhac, pp. 131, 132. They amount to forty-three, and there are probably others. Besides the works of which MSS. were common, we find some that were rare: A. Gellius, Florus, Justin, Lucretius, Plautus, Propertius, Quintilian, Spartianus, Trebellius Pollio, Varro, Vibius Sequester, Vitruvius.

The MS. has the following entries from Catullus (De Nolhac, p. 140) lxiv. 327 *Currite ducenti sub tegmine currite fusi* (cited on Ecl. iv. 46); xxxv. 4 *Comi menia Lariumque litus* (on G. ii. 158); xxxix. 11 *aut parvus Umber aut obesus Etruscus* (on G. ii. 192); lxiv. 171, 2 *Iuppiter omnipotens utinam ne tempore primo Cnossia Cecropiae tetigissent litora puppes* (fol. 114 of the MS.).

Of these four citations, the first and fourth are found in Macrobius and may come from a MS. of the Saturnalia, not a MS. of Catullus. The second and third must have come from a codex of Catullus' poems, either the original brought back by the poet's Veronese compatriot or a copy.

There are two other annotations in the Ambrosian Vergil which are of rather more importance for a history of the text of Catullus. Commenting on the words of Servius' Introd. to the Aeneid<sup>1</sup> 'nescientes hanc esse artem poeticam ut a mediis incipientes per narrationem prima reddamus,' Petrarch writes *hoc signanter servat Catullus in Peplon*, obviously referring to the bridal quilt on which was wrought the story of Ariadne and Theseus as described in *The Nuptials of Peleus and Thetis* (lxiv. 47-264). Here

<sup>1</sup> Vol. II. p. 4, of Thilo's edition of Servius.



we detect the poet criticizing and approving the rules of art on which his Roman predecessor had worked; it is obvious that Petrarch had not only read, but carefully studied, the whole episode, can we doubt?, the whole poem.

The other is apropos of Sallust's over-estimate of Cato as *Romani generis disertissimus*<sup>1</sup> (Serv. on Aen. i. 96) on which Petrarch remarks *quod M. Tullio potest convenire; cui enim dignius? testes sunt innumeri, sed secretior Catullus Veronensis poeta quadam ad ipsum Tullium epistola his verbis: Disertissime Romuli nepotum, Quot sunt, quotque fuere, Marce Tulli, Quotque post aliis erunt in annis* (Cat. xlix. 1-3). In this passage what is the meaning of *secretior*? In what sense could Catullus be a more secret witness? Perhaps there may be an intimation in so *particular* a word that the poems were not yet allowed full publicity, and were copied only sparsely and with reservation.

The references to Catullus in the Latin writings of Petrarch are not yet ascertained with anything like completeness, and are often of uncertain date. He speaks of the poet as Catullus, sometimes as Catullus Veronensis. This is when he cites him by name: in other passages he cites words which must come from a MS. of the poems without any mention of his name.

To the former class belong:

1. From a letter to (Ni)cola di Rienzi written at Avignon in 1347, *Eloquio Ciceronem* (te dicunt) *ad quem Catullus Veronensis ait: Disertissime Romuli nepotum.*
2. From Petrarch's treatise<sup>2</sup> *de remediis utriusque fortunae*, i. 59 (p. 55, ed. Bas.) *Si per te ipsum illos paueris, quid nisi occupatissimus pastor eris. Officium uile laudatum licet a multis ante alios a Catullo Veronensi.*

<sup>1</sup> Fr. i. 4 in Maurenbrecher's *Sallusti Historiarum Reliquiae*.

<sup>2</sup> Körting states (*Petrarch's Leben und Werke*, p. 542), on the authority of a MS. at Venice (Z. L. 475) written 1398 but copied from Petrarch's autograph codex, that the *de rem. u. f.* was finished October 4, 1366.

A slip of memory; he confused Catullus with Tibullus (i. 1, i. 5, ii. 3).

3. Ib. i. 69 (p. 63, ed. Bas.).

Quid ex uestris Ouidio? Catullo? Propertio? Tibullo?  
quorum nullum ferme nisi amatorium est poema.

It is *probable* that Petrarch had read *all* the poets he mentions here, though there seem to be no Tibullian excerpts in the Ambrosian Vergil.

4. Praef. to B. II of *de rem. u. f.* (p. 104, ed. Bas.).

Stultorum risus quo inepto res ineptior nulla est,  
ut Catullus ait.

5. In *Epist. rer. Senil.* xi. 3 (p. 884, ed. Bas.), from a letter written at Padua after the election of Pope Urban V in 1362, 'Solet enim ut Catul(l)i Veronensis uerbo utar meas aliquid putare nugas.'

If Petrarch took this from the preface of Pliny's *Natural History* he has altered the order of the words, which the MSS. of Pliny give thus: 'Namque tu solebas putare esse aliquid (oraliquid esse) meas nugas' or esse aliquid meas putare nugas.

The following are taken from a MS. of the poems, but with no mention of Catullus' name:

6. *De rem. u. f.* i. 33 (p. 32, ed. Bas.).

Nulla fugae, nulla spes est igitur salutis.

Palpably from Cat. lxiv. 186. Did Petrarch read *nullast spes*? Our MSS. give *nulla spes*.

7. *Epist. Famil.* iii. 3 (p. 608, ed. Bas.).

Omnibus bellorum ducibus qui sunt quique erunt  
omnibus seculis.

8. *Epist. sine titulo* xiv (p. 725).

Omnibus qui sunt et qui fuerunt eruntue mortalibus.

This combination of past, present, and future which Catullus has introduced three times in his hendecasyllabic poems seems to have struck Petrarch. It recurs, unless my memory deceives me, in the Italian poems.

9. *Epist. Rer. Famil.* v. 5 (p. 644, ed. Bas.).

Magis magisque crebresceret: from Cat. lxiv. 274.

In the short biography of himself which Petrarch addressed to Posterity, and with which the Basel edition

commences, he gives a chronology of his early life which for literary purposes, such as the present inquiry, must be considered very valuable. He was born at Arezzo on July 20, 1304, a Monday. His infancy and childhood were passed at Florence or on his father's country estate fourteen miles off; in his eighth year he was at Pisa; he was nine when the family moved to Avignon on the left bank of the Rhone, to which city, Babylon<sup>1</sup> of the exile as it is called again and again in the letters, the Popes had now transferred their seat, and from which they did not finally move till the pontificate of Gregory XI in 1377. At Carpentras he learnt the rudiments of Grammar, Logic, and Rhetoric, remaining there four whole years; thence he was sent to Montpellier to study Law. Here also he remained four years; the next three he was at Bologna still working at law; he returned to Avignon when he was in his twenty-second year, i.e. in 1326. It was in April of 1327 that he first saw Laura de Noves, as he has recorded with his own hand in the Ambrosian Vergil, and the same note informs us that she died in April 1348<sup>2</sup>. This entirely agrees with the statement of the biography: *amore acerrimo, sed unico et honesto in adolescentia laboravi, et diutius laborassem, nisi iam tepescentem ignem mors acerba sed utilis extinxisset.*

Körting in his *Petrarch's Leben und Werke* assures us that it is an impossible task to fix the chronology of the Italian poems, and that all the attempts to do so have failed. Furthermore it was the poet's habit, as Ugo Foscolo has shown (*Essays*, p. 56), to alter the diction and setting of his *Rime*, sometimes to the extent of rewriting them<sup>3</sup>. None the less it remains true that these poems represent the period of Petrarch's life when both his passion and his fancy

<sup>1</sup> Epist. sine titulo, p. 716, ed. Basil, written from the Western Babylon as he calls Avignon. In another written about the same time (p. 719, ed. Basil.) he calls himself 'an exile from Jerusalem amid the rivers of Babylon.'

<sup>2</sup> De Nolhac, p. 407.

<sup>3</sup> Mestica, *Rime di Fr. Petrarca*, p. x 'Nessuno de' nostri poeti à tanto lavorato in correzioni, per quello cho se ne sa, quanto il Petrarca,' and



were at their height, in other words his youth and early manhood. As Catullus says of himself

Iucundum cum aetas florida uer ageret,  
Multa satis lusi: non est dea nescia nostri,  
Quae dulcem curis miscet amaritiem.

With both poets the same reason would interfere to prevent excessive re-casting; Petrarch, if Beccadelli may be trusted, thought all his works might be improved *except* the *Rime*<sup>1</sup>. The form which love had originally impressed would survive, or if changed, would only be changed slightly. We may fairly assume that the *Sonetti* and *Canzoni* remain to a large extent much as they were when first conceived, i.e. in the years whilst Laura was still alive from 1327 to 1348.

This point is of some importance for the question I am here discussing. The Italian poems contain some passages immediately and unmistakably moulded on Catullus, others where the resemblance is slighter, yet such as to point in the same direction.

Son. 288 (Mestica, p. 472):

‘S’ onesto amor pô meritar mercede,  
E se pietà ancor pô quant’ ella suole,  
Mercede avrò.’

Cat. lxxvi. 1:

Siqua recordanti benefacta priora uoluptas  
Est homini, cum se cogitat esse pium,  
Nec sanctam uiolasse fidem nec foedere in ullo  
Dinum ad fallendos numine abusum homines,  
Multa parata manent in longa aetate, Catulle,  
Ex hoc ingrato gaudia amore tibi.

Son. 50 (Mestica, p. 95):

again ‘tornava e ritornava con la lima per lunghe sequenze di anni o anche dopo una ventina.’ Cod. Vat. 3196 contains a number of such sketches in the poet’s own hand: they have been published by Appel, and in photographic facsimile by Monaci.

<sup>1</sup> *Vita di Petrarca* in Tomasini’s *Petrarcha Redivivus*, p. 238: ‘Ha lasciato scritto Pietro Paolo Vergerio haver inteso da Celutio Salutato Fiorentino, che fu secretario di Papa Urbano et amico del Petrarca, ch’ a lui auua detto, come le sue composizioni tutte poteva migliorare assai, dalle rime in poi, nelle quali s’era tanto alzato, che più non li daua l’animo d’arriuarli.’

‘Non prego già, né puote aver piú loco,  
Che mesuratamente il mio cor arda;  
Ma che sua parte abbi costei del foco.’

Cat. lxxvi. 23:

Non iam illud quaero contra ut me diligat illa  
Aut quod non potis est, esse pudica uelit.

Both these passages are modelled directly on the same poem of Catullus; but the sonnets where they occur are distinct and perhaps removed by a long interval. Is it not the most probable hypothesis that Petrarch was in *neither* case indebted to a friend for a copy either of this single poem or of the whole series of the *liber Catulli*, but was in possession of a complete codex of his own, and that it was from this that he has drawn his inspiration in the two sonnets just quoted, as well as the direct quotations either contained in his prose works or entered in the margin of his Vergil? And if it was his habit to employ a number of copyists (de Nolhac, p. 69), is it conceivable that he would consent to be without a copy of a poet as great as Catullus?

I am not unaware that Coluccio Salutati, who speaks of Petrarch as possessing or likely to possess in his library a MS. of Propertius, does not say he possessed a Catullus. But this was only a short time after Petrarch's death in 1374, and Salutati, it is probable, speaks with nothing like complete knowledge of the contents of his library.

Son. 62 (p. 129 M.):

‘Se bianche non sono prima ambe le tempie.’

Cat. lxi. 154:

tremulum mouens

Canā tempus anilitas.

Son. 285 (p. 463 M.):

‘Ma inanzi agli occhi m'era post' un velo  
Che mi fêa non veder quel ch' i' vedea.’

Cat. lxiv. 55:

Necdum etiam sese quae uisit uisere credit.

Indeed the whole of this exquisite sonnet is steeped in Catullus, particularly reflecting c. xxx, to Alfenus:

Or conosco i miei danni, or mi risento;  
 Ch' i credeva (ahi credenze vane e 'nfirme!)  
 Perder parte, non tutto, al dipartirme:

Quante speranze se ne porta il vento!

Cat. xxx. 9, 10:

Idem nunc retrahis te ac tua dicta omnia factaque  
 Ventos irrita ferre ac nebulas aereas sinis.

Sestina I (p. 25 M.):

E non ci vedess' altri que le stelle  
 Sol una notte.

Cat. vii. 7, 8:

Aut quam sidera multa, cum tacet nox,  
 Furtiuos hominum uident amores.

Trionf. di Amore, ii. 185 (p. 551 M.):

'vita dègli amanti  
 Com' poco dolce molto amaro appaga.'

Cat. lxviii. 17, 18:

non est dea nescia nostri,  
 Quae dulcem curis miscet amaritiem.

The same idea *pervades* the *Rime* from first to last.

Son. 177 (p. 304 M.):

Solco onde, e 'n rena fondo, e scrivo in vento.

Cat. lxx. 4:

In uento et rapida scribere oportet aqua.

A passage, which as de Nolhae observes (p. 138), is also alluded to in Petrarch's Latin treatise against physicians (ed. Bas., p. 1093) 'Vos si gloriae cupiditas tangit, in uento et aqua scribite ut ad posteros fama citius uestra perueniat.'

## APPENDIX

### MUSSATO AND THE TRAGEDY *ACHILLES*

Todeschini in a pamphlet entitled *Del vero autore della tragedia L'Achille*, published in 1832 at Vicenza, was the first to make a serious defence of the attribution of the *Achilles* not to Mussato, but to Antonio Loschi, as affirmed by Ignazio Savi, Librarian of the Municipal Library of Vicenza, in a note published in the twelfth volume of Castellini's *Storia di Vicenza*, 1821. His arguments are :

1. Only one tragedy, the *Ecerinis*, is ever mentioned as Mussato's by himself, his contemporaries, or in the epitaph in St. Justina. Sicho Polentone in his work *De scriptoribus illustribus latinae linguae*, writes *nomini eius inscripta Ecerinis tragedia, non ignobile opus, extat*, but has no word of *Achilles*.

2. The *Achilles* was not ascribed to Mussato till it was printed amongst his other works by Felice Osio, Professor of Humanity at Padua, at the Venice Pinelli Press, 1635. Of the four MSS. of Mussato's poems used by Osio, one, the Mussatianus, a codex belonging to Antonio Mussato of Padua, and dated 1390, contained after *Ecerinis* another tragedy, the *Achilles*, which he therefore printed also, 'etsi styli diuersitas scriptoris alterius calamum referre uideatur.'

3. The difference of style, noticed by Osio, between the *Ecerinis* and the *Achilles* was equally perceptible to Villani of Pistoia, who, in the few notes he has left on the play, pronounced the *Achilles* to be better in plot than *Ecerinis*, equally good in style, and far inferior in its moral teaching.

As compared with the *Ecerinis* the *Achilles* shows more study of ancient poets, an advance in Latin idiom and diction, a more exact observance of the laws of metre. It has nothing plebeian or vulgar. In Mussato's acknowledged tragedy there is no unity of time or action or protagonist, it is always a question where the scene is laid : the work belongs to the infancy of the art, or rather is wholly without art. Quite different is the texture of *Achilles* : it has unity of action, for everything leads up to the death of Achilles ; of place, all being done in Troy ; of time, a single day. Had Mussato treated this subject, he would have made more of the disdain of Achilles for Agamemnon, and perhaps extended the action to the destruction of Troy.

4. This difference of style is in fact not the difference of one mind at different periods of life, but of two epochs, one of which has progressed far beyond the other.

5. It is not likely that Mussato would have had the inclination or the knowledge necessary for a mythological subject. His life of active public

occupation predisposed him for subjects taken from actual history, like the rise and fall of the tyrants Ezzelini.

Part II (Todeschini, p. 10).

If it is *a priori* improbable that Mussato wrote *Achilles*, we have actual reasons for ascribing it to a much later poet, Antonio Loschi.

Santa Maria *Biblioteca e storia degli scrittori di Vicenza*, 1772, I. p. cclvii) states that in certain unedited memoirs of Giambattista della Valle a tragedy called *Achilles* was attributed to Antonio Loschi, and that della Valle professed to have it in his own possession. The heading was

*Achiles*

Antonii de Luschis de Vincentia Tragedia incipit,  
at the end

Antonii de Luschis de Vincentia tragedia explicit Achilles. Laus sit Deo. Amen.

Some fifteen or twenty years before Todeschini's pamphlet appeared (1817 or 1812) a Vicentine, Franc. Testa, gave to the public library there a MS. which seems to be identical with that of della Valle. It had once been in possession of a Venetian noble, Teodoro Corraro. It agrees with the description of della Valle's MS. in being 'd'ottimo carattere, conservatissima,' as also in the words of the *titulus* at the beginning, and the words of the *Explicit*. This tragedy is identical with the *Achilles* printed as Mussato's in 1635. The MS. containing it is of cent. xiv-xv<sup>1</sup>. It may well have been a copy of Loschi's original, corrected either by himself or some one in his confidence. In about 150 passages it emends the reading of ed. Ven., in many cases supporting the conjectures of Osio or Villani.

Loschi was not only a man of importance in affairs—holding various offices under Duke John Galeazzo Visconti of Milan—sent on missions to the Holy See—in favour with five successive Popes, one of whom, Martin V, appointed him ambassador to the Emperor Sigismund—but famous as a man of letters. His commentary on eleven orations of Cicero was largely read in the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, and as a writer of Latin verse he held a distinguished, if not the first, place, so much so, that Lorenzo Valla was censured for preferring the compositions of Bartolommeo di Pulciani to his. The only difficulty is in the dates. Osio's Codex Mussatianus containing the *Achiles* had the year 1390 appended to the *finale* of *Eccerinis*, i.e. about sixty years after the death of Mussato and at least fifty before the death of Loschi<sup>2</sup>. If both the tragedies were copied at the same time, Loschi must have been a mere boy at the time when he is supposed to have written *Achilles*. Todeschini answers this objection by quoting a brief of Pope Boniface IX of Feb. 11, 1390, in which Antonio Loschi, then a student in the University of Pavia, is called 'arciprete della chiesa padovana' and is appointed to

<sup>1</sup> Mazzatinti, in his Catalogue of the MSS. at Vicenza (vol. ii), describes it as belonging to the fifteenth century. Mr. E. O. Winstedt thinks it late fifteenth.

<sup>2</sup> The death-year of Loschi is uncertain; Tiraboschi, *Storia della letteratura Italiana*, vi. 915, fixes it between 1447 and 1450. Others place it as early as 1441.

a 'prebenda canoniale,' in the Cathedral of Padua, formerly held by Petrarch; and by citing express evidences of Loschi's precocity as a writer. If it is argued that the *Achilles* is nowhere ascribed to Loschi by any writer who mentions him, it may be replied that Marzani in his history of Vicenza says he composed *dottissime tragedie*; that tragedies are attributed to him by Barbarano and Castellini; and that Galasso di Cavazzoli (Vicentine poet and notary) writes of him *Qui fontem Parnase tuum decoratque cothurnis Maiores, Luscus non reticendus erit*<sup>1</sup>.

Todeschini's pamphlet is generally supposed to have settled the question of the authorship of *Achilles*. Its strong point is its negative side; the arguments against its being a work of Mussato's form a strong case, though they do not amount to proof. Its weaker side is the attempt to prove that *Achilles* was the work of Antonio Loschi.

I shall say a few words on both points.

1. The discovery of the Holkham MS. (no. 425) of Mussato's poems, which was unknown to Todeschini, materially strengthens the case for Mussato. Padrin, *Ecerinide*, pp. xvii, xviii, describes this MS. at length. I have myself examined it in the Bodleian. It is of the fourteenth century, and consists of three parts. The first contains, in hexameters books ix, x, xi of Mussato's *De gestis Italic. post Henricum VII*, ending with the words *De conflictu domini Canis grandis Explicit 1390*. The second part contains the other Latin poems of Mussato, including the two on Priapus and Priapus' wife omitted by Osio, and ending with the tragedy *Ecerinis* followed by the words *Albertini Muxati Paduani Ecerini tragedia explicit 1390*. Then *Achilles* (without mention of author) and the Bucolicum carmen printed by Osio.

Part III contains the *Ilias Latina* (Bährens, *PLM*, iii. 3-64), or, as it was called in the Middle Age, and in the Holkham MS., *Liber Pindari tebani de destructione Troye*. In general the Holkham codex shows a surprising agreement with the Codex Mussatianus from which Osio printed the *Achilles*; it would seem, however, from the examination of its readings in the *Ecerinis* made by Padrin, to differ in some details, and to be either a second copy of the same original, or perhaps a direct transcript of the *Mussatianus*. Both MSS. conspire (1) in the date 1390, (2) in including *Achilles*, which both place immediately after *Ecerinis*, without assigning any author, (3) in the Carmen Priapi and De coniuge Priapi, as well as the Carmen bucolicum.

The existence of two MSS. dated 1390 in which the *Achilles* is appended to the other acknowledged poems of Mussato is, in my<sup>2</sup> judgement, an

<sup>1</sup> Santa Maria, *Scrittori di Vicenza*, i. p. ccl, quotes from an hexameter poem of Loschi's addressed to Antonio de Romagno, the following verses which might apply to a tragedy either written or planned on the Return of Ulysses from Troy:

ad sua forsan  
Tectæ meus pelago et ventis iactatus Ulysses  
Naufragus accensa victor properasset ab urbe  
Iudicium et cari limen subiturus amici.

<sup>2</sup> Such is also the opinion of Mr. Alexander Napier, the Librarian of Holkham.



indication that at that time it was at least in some quarters ascribed to him. It is true this might be a consequence of the external similarity of the two plays, both being based on Seneca's tragedies, and both imperfect in their comprehension of his metrical rules. The difference lies chiefly in two points, the greater absence of technic in the *Ecerinis*, which betrays itself principally in the illegitimate caesuras of the iambic, and in the much greater liveliness of its situations, or perhaps one should say, descriptions, as compared with the unexcited and monotonous character of the *Achilles*. The criticism of that time was not likely to think of Aristotelian unities: a general resemblance of form would be quite sufficient to determine opinion.

Neither of the two plays, judged from an exacting standpoint, can be pronounced more than mediocre; but the less correct is by far the more interesting, as a narrative of a real Italian tragedy, by an Italian who, if not coeval with the events he described, brought to his task the far greater qualifications of an active life spent in every kind of patriotic service, and an observant eye for the dramatic situations which naturally rise in the course of a long, odious, and successful tyranny, like that of the Ezzelini. This, and the glory attending Mussato's coronation, as the author of *Ecerinis*, would give an unique importance to the play, and would have acted alike to keep it standing on a pedestal of its own, and to prevent any other drama, not expressly known to be by Mussato, from coming into competition with it. Hence, even supposing Mussato to have employed some part of his spare time as an exile at Chioggia, where he died in 1329, in writing a tragedy on stricter rules and a more commonplace subject drawn from Greek mythology, it would not follow that it was recognized as his, unless he had expressly set his name to it, or perhaps unless he had published it in his lifetime. We might imagine the *Achilles* left imperfect, and for some years after his death copied but rarely, and without his name; gradually its general resemblance to *Ecerinis* would be remarked, and would cause its inclusion in a volume containing that or other poems by Mussato: the poet's name would not be added because it was not certainly known. We must not forget that there is no hint of *Achilles* belonging to any other author than Mussato in Muratori, Scipio Maffei, or Tiraboschi; and that the increased study of MSS. in our own age places us in a position of advance much beyond the epoch of Todeschini's dissertation.

Coming to the second of Todeschini's positions, I am exceedingly conscious of its insecurity.

1. The birth-year of Loschi is not ascertained, and the same doubt hangs over his death. But as the brief of Boniface IX dated 1390 confers a prebendal stall upon him and calls him Arciprete, it is difficult to believe he can have been under the age of incipient manhood, say eighteen to twenty. It follows that when he wrote *Achilles* (if he wrote it) he must have been a mere boy. I do not think this is at all the impression which the play gives. It is difficult to believe it could have been written under the age at the very least of seventeen or eighteen, especially if we consider the rarity at that time of metrical manuals, and all the resources which

from the fifteenth century to the present time have facilitated the composition of Latin verse.

Still, conceding that *Achilles* might have been written by a young boy of unusual precocity, some time would elapse before it was transcribed, and when transcribed it would naturally carry with it its author's name. But in the two earliest copies no such name is appended, it is only in the third and considerably later copy that the play is attributed at the beginning and end to Loschi. And this is exactly what happens in other cases of false attribution. A work of doubtful authorship is at first transcribed without any name; as time goes on, a false or at least uncertain name is attached. The very MS. at Holkham which contains *Achilles* is followed by the Latin hexametrical epitome of the *Iliad* (of unknown authorship) with the ridiculous title *Pindari tebani de destructione Troje*. The minor poems ascribed to Vergil in MSS. as early as the ninth century are most of them by unknown writers, and cannot possibly be Vergil's. Tibullus was long supposed on the ascription of MSS. to be the author of the third and fourth books of *Elegiacs* which Lachmann and most critics since Lachmann give to Lygdamus. Few critics nowadays believe the *Nux* to be a genuine work of Ovid's: yet in the MSS. it is assigned to him. These are only a few out of many similar cases. The natural conclusion to be drawn from the fact that in the two MSS. dated 1390 the *Achilles* is given without a name, in the third is attributed to Loschi, is that at the time when those two MSS. were written the author was unknown, in the interval between them and the third, a claimant had sprung up to whom the authorship might reasonably be assigned. Whether Loschi had anything to do with this himself we cannot say; it would be enough for our purpose if he was known to have composed Latin tragedies of sufficient merit to make a name.

To repeat once more less particularly what I have said above, I think it very improbable, in the light of the Mussatian and Holkham MSS., which add the date of transcription (the latter *twice*) 1390, that the *Achilles*, ranked as it is with Mussato's famous drama *Ecerinis*, should have been written by a boy however precocious; or should have approached in the time of its composition so very near to that year. Everything points in the opposite direction; it must have been composed considerably *before* that year, perhaps, if not a work of Mussato's, at a time not so very long after his death in 1329. The *Ecerinis* had probably popularized the study of Seneca's tragedies, and the *Achilles* was one of the attempts to reproduce their diction and metre in an age which with Petrarch as its protagonist was growing daily more and more humanistic.

The question is of some interest as regards the transmission of Catullus, If, as I think is likely, the words of the *Achilles*, *Nemo tam fortis ualeat esse quo non Fortior assit*, are based on Catull. lxvi. 28 *quod* (al. *quo*) *non fortior aut sit alis*, we have a very early correction, perhaps the earliest, of the corrupt tradition of the Catullian MSS., all of which give *aut sit*. It is true that *assit* is not the most probable correction of *aut sit*, but it is a possible, and even an ingenious, correction. Professor Bywater has discovered



the rightful claimant of *ausit*<sup>1</sup>, which palaeography pronounces to be the true emendation of *aut sit*; he traces it to Pietro Nicetti of Lucca, a contemporary of Poliziano at the close of the fifteenth century. Let us not forget in this age of palaeographical illumination, when a large proportion of even Bentley's corrections are seen to be impossible, the slow degrees by which classical philology has arrived at its present position of comparative assurance. The fourteenth-century emendator (surely no boy) may have guessed wrong; but his guess is to say the least clever, and easily intelligible; and what is more to the point, it is, *if* an emendation, perhaps the earliest discoverable of the text of Catullus.

<sup>1</sup> Compare *aut del* for *audet*, *aut derent* for *auderent* in Schuchart, *Vokalismus des Vulgärlateins*, i. p. 121.

## PETRARCH AND PROPERTIUS.

Prof. J. S. Phillimore has sent me the following imitations of Propertius which he has noted in Petrarch's Latin poems.

Petr. *Africa*, Bk. I. p. 1275 b (ed. Basil. 1554) milia curarum.

Prop. I. v. 10 At tibi curarum milia quanta dabit.

Petr. *Africa*, III. 1284 a at pastorali baculum fert more recurvum.

Prop. IV. ii. 39 Pastorem ad baculum possum curuare.

Petr. *Africa*, III. 1287 a      peccati conscius orbis

Erexit . . . . . columnas.

Prop. III. xi. 19 qui pacato statuisset in orbe columnas.

Petr. *Africa*, IV. 1292 a qualis inest . . . color.

Prop. I. ii. 22 qualis . . . est color in tabulis.

Petr. *Africa*, V. 1294 a candida purpureis imitantur floribus almae

*Lilia mixta* genae roseis.

Prop. I. xx. 38 candida purpureis . . .

Prop. II. iii. 10-12 lilia non . . . magis alba :

utque rosae . . .

Petr. *Africa*, V. 1294 a huic leues longaeque manus.

Prop. II in 5 longaeque manus.

Prop. III. vii. 60 . . . longas . . . manus.

Petr. *Africa*, VII. 1310 a quid sim, quid fuerim.

Prop. II. ix. i iste quod est, ego saepe fui.

Petr. *Africa*, VIII. 1318 b 1 non minor ipso animis.

Prop. II. xxxiv. 83 nec minor his (? ipse) animis.

Petr. *Africa*, VIII, 1318 b 26 ibat honorato . . . curru.

Prop. IV. xi. 102 honoratis . . . equis.

Petr. *Africa*, VIII, 1323 b 23 Piscibus aut pelagi medias effluunt in unola

Ena foret.

*Epist.* II. 1355 b 20 piscibus e. e. un.

Prop. III. vii. 8 piscibus cœca natat.



OXFORD : HORACE HART  
PRINTER TO THE UNIVERSITY





UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY

Los Angeles

This book is DUE on the last date stamped below.

315

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA  
AT  
LOS ANGELES  
LIBRARY



UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY



**AA** 000 438 083 8



3 1158 00538 1834

